

PATENT  
450100-02862**REMARKS**

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 8-11 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Changes to the claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

The Examiner has reasserted the objection to the claims for use of the term "voice" recognition instead of "speech" recognition. Applicants would like to bring to the Examiner's attention that both Kamiya and Petrushin (the cited prior art references) use the term "voice recognition" in an analogous manner to the present application. Regardless, Applicants have replaced the term "voice" with "speech" throughout the claims. Accordingly, this objection to the claims has now been overcome.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya et al. (U.S. Patent 6,629,242) in view of Petrushin (Published U.S. Patent Application 2002/0194002).

However, in the present invention, "the state is determined by an action, an emotion state,

PATENT  
450100-02862

and an instinct state of the robot.” (Claim 1) The Examiner contends Kamiya meets this limitation by “(adaptation of the neural network is subjected to an evaluation of a decided action (instinct) that is based on its current emotion state and how this action is judged by the user, col. 8, lines 34-60)” (Office Action page 4) Applicants believe the Examiner’s interpretation of Kamiya is incorrect. At the cited location, Kamiya discloses the robot “recogniz[es] the user’s reaction in response to robot’s own behavior” and “the user’s state and/or the user’s intention/emotional expression at the moment; and to thereby learn the results of adjustment.” In other words, Kamiya is concerned with the user’s emotional state and how the action is judged by the user; rather than the emotional state of the robot and how the action is judged by the robot as required in the present invention.

Furthermore, in the present invention, “the value corresponding to each state within the emotion model and within the instinct model are linked in a mutually stimulating manner and changed based on said control pitch information or said phonemics information” (Claim 1) The Examiner concedes that Kamiya does not teach the recited control pitch information or phonemics information and instead relies on Petrushin to meet these limitations. Although Petrushin does disclose extracting the pitch information, it does not disclose extracting phonemics information as required in the present invention.

Also, in the present invention, “said robot takes actions corresponding to a reliability of the speech recognition results output from said speech recognizing means, or the emotion state of said robot is changed based on said reliability.” (Claim 1) The Examiner contends Kamiya discloses “(performs speech recognition which would inherently have an acoustic model that would choose the corresponding meaning with the highest probability hence the most reliable, col. 6, lines 9-15)” (Office Action page 4) Although the Examiner’s statement is correct, it does

PATENT  
450100-02862

not meet the present limitation. The present invention obtains a speech recognition result and that result has a corresponding reliability value. This is not equivalent to selecting the speech recognition result having the highest reliability value as asserted by the Examiner. Moreover, the present invention uses this reliability value to determine further actions and/or change the emotion state of the robot.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Kamiya and Petrushin fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0321).

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 

Darren M. Simon  
Reg. No. 47,946  
(212) 588-0800